DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 322 CG 017 563

AUTHOR Hadiyono, Johana E. P.; Kahn, Marvin W.
TITLE Personality Differences and Sex Similarities in American and Indonesian College Students.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (64th, Los Angeles, CA, April 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Differences; *Cultural Influences; Higher Education; *Personality Traits; *Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Indonesia

ABSTRACT

To determine if personality characteristics reflect influences of culture, while sex differences remain similar across cultures, 100 Indonesian and 100 American college students completed the Cattell Clinical Analysis Questionnaire, in the appropriate language. An analysis of the results showed that females in both cultures were higher than males on sensitivity, conformity, and shrewdness, and males were higher than females on stability, dominance, impulsiveness and radicalness. Overall comparison showed Americans significantly higher on emotional stability, dominance, impulsiveness, forthrightness and radicalism, compared to Indonesians who were significantly higher on submissiveness, emotionality, shrewdness, and practicality. American females were higher than Indonesian females on stability, dominance, boldness, and forthrightness, and significantly less submissive, prudent, timid and conservative. American males compared to Indonesian males were higher on stability, dominance, impulsiveness and radicalism. The American students reflected traits which were consistent with United States values, such as independence and material success. Indonesian students reflected traits consistent with deference to family and utilitarian values. The male-female differences were the same for both cultures, suggesting the existence of certain personality similarities based on sex, despite differences based on culture. (Author/BL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246322

Personality Differences and Sex Similarities in American and Indonesian College Students

Johana E. P. Hadiyono & Marvin W. Kahn

University of Arizona

Running head: PERSONALITY DIFFERENCES AND SEX SIMILARITIES

CG 017563

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Johana Hadiyono
Marvin W. Kahn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

One hundred Indonesian and 100 American university students were compared on all personality traits of the Cattell Clinical Analysis Questionnaire, in the appropriate language at each respective university. Similar male-female differences were found in both groups and on the same personality demonstrations. Females in both cultures were higher than males on sensitivity, conformity, shrewdness, and males higher than females on stability, dominance, impulsiveness and radicalness. Overall comparison showed Americans significantly higher on emotional stability, dominance, impulsiveness, forthrightness and radicalism, as compared to Indonesians who were significantly higher on submissiveness, emotionality, shrewdness and practicality. American females were higher than Indonesian females on stability, dominance, boldness, forthrightness and significantly less submissive, prudent, timid and conservative. American males compared to Indonesian males were higher on stability, dominance, impulsiveness and radicalism. The results support the H_o that personality characteristic reflect influences of culture and that sex differences are similar across cultures. The American students reflect traits which are consistent with U.S. values such as independence and material success while Indonesian students reflect traits consistent with difference to family and utilitarian values. Within each culture

there are sex differences. These male-female differences are on the same traits for both cultures suggesting certain similarities the personality on the bases of sex, despite differences on the bases of culture.

Personality Differences and Sex Similarities in American and Indonesian College Students

Sex differences in personality across cultures have often been assumed although seldom well-investigated. D'Andrade et al., 1969; Seward & Seward, 1980; Whiting & Edwards, 1974 indicate that females are frequently characterized as more dependent, passive, compliant, nurturant, responsible, and sociable, than males, who are in turn, characterized as being more dominant, aggressive, and active.

Chodorow (1974) has theorized that differences in basic male and female personality are the result of a universal experience pattern in human families. The female, according to Chodorow, universally is the primary caretaker of infants and young children. For that reason the initial sex identification is with the female for both sexes. The female retains this primary identity with the mother and with the mother's caring relationship role, while the male must separate from that early identity, and shift identity to an often, less than available, almost abstract male figure. As a result of this presumed universal phenomena, the personality characteristics of the female emphasizes relationships and caring, from the primary identity, and other factors which follow from that experience. Male personality characteristics on the other hand emphasize separateness, independence from others, and a greater emphasis on abstract

approach to thinking and conceptualization.

This study investigated male-female personality characteristics in college students in two different cultures--the United States and Indonesia. The Chodorow formulation would predict that despite cultural differences, there would be a greater degree of caring and relationship attributes in the females of both cultures, as compared to males who would show a greater degree of separate, detached, and assertive characteristics.

Comparisons of Americans with peoples of other nationalities and cultures has been widely reported (Kahn et al., 1966; White et al., 1981; Holtzman and Schwartz, 1975). In comparison to other cultures, Americans are generally reported as being more outgoing, assertive, and/or venturesome. There have been on the other hand, very few studies of personality of Indonesians. Noesjirwan (1977, 1978) found Indonesians in contrast to Australians to have greater emphasis on interpersonal closeness.

While generalizations about the typical personality of a given culture or nationality are very risky, in broad perspective there may well be sufficient differences to generally differentiate groups. The culture of the United States for instance, has a tradition of individualism, individual freedoms, independence and challenge of authority (Kahn et al., 1966). Indonesians, like Americans, are made up of literally hundreds of

ethnic groups, each with their own characteristics and cultural identity. Nonetheless, the Indonesian people have been described in general as having a relatively passive attitude toward life, emphasizing quiet security, self-control, conformity, and group oriented behavior (Geertz, 1963, 1974; Koentjaraningrat, 1979; Peacock, 1973; Suparlan, 1973).

Method

Instrument

The Cattell Clinical Analysis Questionnaire (IPAT, 1970) used with the American students and a translation by Hadiyono (1979) and revised by Sugiyanto and Hadiyono (1979) was used with the Indonesian population. The CAQ has 28 scales, 16 of which concern normal personality dimensions and 7 measure various primary manifestations of depression and 5 are based on a factor analytic score. A list of the 28 scales and a brief indication of the dimensions measured are given in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Subjects

The scale was administered to 100 American and 100 Indonesian college students whose ages were between 18 and 25. In each group 60 were female and 40 were male.

The groups were approximately comparable in terms of sex,

age, social class and educational levels. Within each group there was an ethnic mix.

The Indonesian students were significantly older than the Americans, X = 20.30, standard deviaition 2.245, versus X = 22.00, standard deviation: 1.676. American students were 81% caucasian, and their fathers' occupations were primarily profession (46%) and business (27%). The Indonesian students were 80% Javanese, 45% of their fathers were professional in government service, and 26% businessmen.

Analysis of data

Raw scores were used in all computations. Basically an SPSS ANOVA for unequal N was used for comparing the mean scores and a one-way analysis of variance was used for comparisons within the cultural groups and comparison of sex by culture.

Results

Overall Comparison of Cultures

The data indicate significant differences between American and Indonesian college students populations on the basic personality profiles on the CAQ, although the predictions of the specific trait differences were not totally confirmed. The American students on average were higher on emotional stability, dominance, impulsiveness, conformity, imagination, forthrightness, and radicalism. Conversely, the Indonesian college students were higher on emotionality, submissiveness, prudence, seriousness,

expediency, practicality, shrewdness and conservativism. These findings can be seen in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 About Here

While the two nationality groups differed in terms of their profile, on the psychopathological dimension they were both within the average range.

Sex Differences Within Cultures

Significant sex differences in personality within each culture were found, both American and Indonesian males were higher than their counterpart females on emotional stability, dominance and impulsivity, and females both American and Indonesian were higher than males on warmth, emotionality, prudence, seriousness, and conformity in both cultures, as indicated in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 About Here

American females in comparison to American males were higher on sensitivity, conformity, and shrewdness, while American males scored higher on emotional stability and dominance. On the other scales it appeared that the American males craved more excitement and were less inhibited than American females.

Comparing the Indonesian females with Indonesian males a

somewhat similar pattern of differences existed. Males were higher on emotional stability, dominance, and impulsivity, boldness and self-sufficiency. Also the Indonesian females expressed greater concern with health, and scored higher on anxiety, withdrawal, and inhibition than did the Indonesian males.

Sex Differences Between Cultures

Comparing the cultures by sex, indicated that the American females as compared to the Indonesian females scored in a way to indicate greater emotional stability, dominance, impulsivity, conformity, boldness, sensitivity, imaginativeness, and forthrightness. Conversely, the Indonesian females tended to be more emotional, submissive, prudent, expedient, timid, tough-minded and practical, more shrewd and conservative than the American females. The comparison of the American males to the Indonesian males indicated that the American males were higher on emotional stability, dominance, impulsiveness, imaginativeness and radicalness. The Indonesian males on the other hand were higher than the Americans on sensitivity. These data are given in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 About Here

Discussion

Cultural comparison of psychological variables are frought

with many methodical, conceptual problems and dilemmas. Recent consideration of these are available in Sue, Ito and Bradshaw, 1982; Brislin, 1983; and Trimble, Lonner and Baucher, 1983. In this study, perhaps the most pertinent problem is the use of a questionnaire developed for one culture, that is then used to describe and compare another. Aside of issues of meaningful language translations, there is an assumption of comparable values and concepts implied in the question and their interpretation. Yet if each culture is measured only in its own terms, how can they be meaningfully compared?

The findings of this study must be interpreted with those cautions in mind. Given that university students were compared, that there was some comparable of curriculum and of family-social class level, and further that the test translation appears to be a meaningful one we consider that these findings represent a reasonable "state of the art" data that suggest the following:

1. Overall among students from American and Indonesian Universities there are significant differences in personality traits roughly comparable to various portrayals of their "national character." Americans were more dominant, forthright and radical among other traits, and Indonesians were more submissive, prudent, shrewd and conservative.

2. Comparisons of the two cultures by sex, female-female and male-male differences were consistent with expectations from the

general differences in the cultures. American females were more dominant, impulsive, bold and forthright; Indonesian females more emotional, submissive, shrewd and conservative. American males compared to Indonesian males were more dominant, impulsive, and radical, the Indonesian males were higher on sensitivity.

3. Of key interest to this study was the finding that despite personality differences between the cultures, male and female differences within each culture were more or less paralleled in that personality differences between the males and females were very similar in both cultures.

Males regardless of their culture were more dominant, emotionally stable, impulsive and bold than females. Females regardless of their culture were more sensitive conforming inhibited than their male counterpart. This data is consistent with predictions that stem from Chardorow (1974) formulation of male/female personality differences and with traditional characterizations of male/female differences in personality.

It is of interest that among current American college students much of stereotype of male-female personality differences, by a self report questionnaire is very much present despite social trends emphasizing androgyny and a shift in social values toward fuller male-female equality. The data do hint that the American female in comparison to her male counterpart is somewhat less submissive and inhibited than is the case for the Indonesians.

References

d'Andrade, E. M., Alves, D. de C., & Ford, J. J. (1969). A comparison of North American and Brazilian college students' personality profiles on the 16 PF Questionnaire. International Journal of Psychology, 4(1), 55-58.

Chodorow, N. (1974). Family structure and feminine personality. In M. Z. Rasaldo, & L. Lamphere (Ed.), Woman, culture and society. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Geertz, H. (1963). Indonesian cultures and communities. New Haven: HRAF Press.

Geertz, H. (1974). The vocabulary of emotion: A study of Javanese socialization processes. In R. A. Levine (Ed.), Culture and personality. Chicago: Aldine.

Hadiyono, J. E. P., & Sugiyanto. (1979). Penelitian Pendahuluan Tentang the Clinical Analysis Questionnaire (CAQ) Adaptasi Indonesia (Preliminary Study of the CAQ Indonesian Adaptation). Jurnal Psikologi, 9, 30-36.

Holtzman, W. H., guerro, R. D., & Swartz, J. D. (1975). Personality development in two cultures. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Kahn, N. W., Lee, H. S., Jones, N. F., & Jin, S. K. (1966). A comparison of Korean and American mental patients' attitudes towards mental illness and hospitalization. The International Journal of Psychiatry, 13(1).

Koentjaraningrat (Ed.). (1979). Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia (Human and culture in Indonesia). Jakarta: Djambatan.

Noesjirwan, J. (1977). Contrasting cultural patterns of interpersonal closeness in doctor's waiting room in sydney and Jakarta. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 8(4), 357-368.

Noesjirwan, J. (1978). A rule-based analysis of cultural differences in social behavior: Indonesia and Australia. International Journal of Psychology, 13(4), 305-316.

Seward, J. P., & Seward, G. H. (1980). Sex differences: Mental and tempermental. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Sugiyanto, & Prawitasari Hadiyono, J. E. (1979). Angket Analisis Ciri Sifat (The CAQ Indonesian Adaptation). Yogyakarta: Fakultas psikologi UGM.

Sue, S., Ito, J., & Bradshaw, C. (1982). Ethnic minority research: Trends and directions. In E. E. Jones, and S. Korchin. Minority mental health. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Suparlan, S. (1979). Ethnic groups of Indonesia. The Indonesian Quarterly, 2(2), 53-75.

Trimble, J. E., Lonner, W. J., & Baucher, J. D. (1983). Stalking the EMIC: Alternatives to cross cultural measurement. (Mimeo) The East-West Center, University of Hawaii.

White, M. C., De Sanctis, G., & Crino, M. D. (1981). Achievement, self confidence, personality traits, and leadership ability: A review of literature on sex differences. Psychological Reports, 48, 547-569.

Whiting, B., & Edwards, A. (1974). A cross-cultural analysis of sex differences in the behavior of children aged three through eleven. In R. A. Levine (Ed.), Culture and personality. Chicago: Aldine.

Table 1

The Scales of the Clinical Analysis Questionnaire

Part I

Scale	Low Score	High Score
A: Warmth	reserved, detached, aloof	warm personable, easygoing
B: Intelligence	concrete thinking	abstract thinking
C: Emotional Stability	easily upset, emotional	emotionally stable, calm
E: Dominance	submissive, accommodating	dominant, assertive, competitive
F: Impulsivity	prudent, sober, serious	impulsive, happy-go-lucky
G: Conformity	expedient disregard rules	conforming, conscientious, persistent
H: Boldness	shy, timid, threat-sensitive	bold, venturesome
I: Sensitivity	tough-minded, insensitive	sensitive, tender-minded, unrealistic
L: Suspiciousness	trusting, adaptable	suspicious, hard-to-fool, jealous
M: Imagination	practical, "down-to-earth"	imaginative, absent-minded

Table 1 (continued)

N: Shrewdness	forthright, unpretentious	shrewd, polished, calculating
O: Insecurity	confident, self-satisfied	insecure, apprehensive
Q1: Radicalism	conservative, traditional	experimenting, innovating
Q2: Self-sufficiency	group-adherent, sociable	self-sufficient resourceful
Q3: Self-discipline	undisciplined, uncontrolled	self-disciplined, controlled, precise
Q4: Tension	relaxed	tense, frustrated, driven
Part II		
D1: Hypochondriasis	few somatic complaints	obsessed by ill health
D2: Suicidal depression	contented	despondent, thinks of self-destruction
D3: Agitation	restrained	craves excitement, hypomanic
D4: Anxious depression	composed	shaky, frightened, clumsy

Table 1 (continued)

D5: Low energy depression	energetic	gloomy, worn out, sad
D6: Guilt and resentment	untroubled	guilty, self-critical, resentful
D7: Boredom and withdrawal	seeks relationships with others	seclusive, feels useless
Ia: Paranoia	reasonable	unreasonable, feels persecuted
Pp: Psychopathic deviation	inhibited	uninhibited, unsocialized
Sc: Schizophrenia	reality-oriented	retreats from reality, withdrawn
As: Psychasthenia	noncompulsive	obsessive-compulsive
Ps: Psychological inadequacy	feels competent, has sense of self-worth	feels inferior and unworthy

Note: Scale B was omitted in this study because it is not strictly a personality trait.

Table 2. Comparisons between culture (American and Indonesian) and between sex (female and male) on the CAQ scales.

		Culture					Sex				
		American		Indonesian			Female		Male		
Part	Scale	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Fo	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Fo
I	A	8.07	2.42	8.63	2.07	2.927	8.63	2.33	7.93	2.11	4.505*
	C	11.07	3.08	8.64	2.72	36.363**	8.99	2.99	11.15	2.93	30.243**
	E	9.52	3.36	7.70	2.58	19.834**	7.99	2.94	9.53	3.18	13.542**
	F	9.61	2.59	6.87	2.57	54.104**	7.76	2.93	8.95	2.76	10.522**
	G	11.16	2.82	9.50	2.27	18.580**	10.74	2.67	9.71	2.60	8.061**
	H	9.56	3.51	9.23	2.96	.059	9.10	3.18	9.83	3.29	2.549
	I	8.90	3.11	8.86	2.55	.236	9.09	2.62	8.56	3.12	1.723
	L	9.29	2.60	9.21	2.31	.040	9.49	2.33	8.88	2.59	2.906
	M	9.83	2.74	7.81	2.40	28.047**	8.65	2.81	9.07	2.68	1.299
	N	6.89	2.46	8.62	2.62	7.187**	7.80	2.48	7.07	2.42	.034
	O	6.80	2.85	7.77	2.80	1.118	7.20	2.83	7.41	2.78	.050
	Q1	8.41	3.30	6.94	2.51	14.636**	7.36	2.82	8.13	2.90	3.719
	Q2	9.07	2.67	8.45	2.83	.152	8.19	2.58	9.61	2.51	3.724
	Q3	9.81	2.70	9.61	2.42	.300	9.69	2.47	9.73	2.70	.015
	Q4	7.27	3.12	7.96	2.29	2.843	7.87	2.80	7.22	2.65	2.703
II	D1	3.30	3.33	5.43	3.76	15.350**	4.75	3.85	3.78	3.41	3.570
	D2	2.44	3.23	4.03	3.01	10.388**	3.26	3.03	3.18	3.49	.031
	D3	12.81	3.63	14.18	3.37	6.575*	12.77	3.39	14.57	3.56	13.454**
	D4	6.08	3.51	7.08	2.82	4.373*	7.05	2.86	5.87	3.59	6.690*
	D5	6.66	4.53	9.03	3.05	14.862**	7.70	3.73	8.06	4.47	.427
	D6	6.13	4.63	11.28	3.90	64.161**	8.87	5.00	8.45	5.00	.475
	D7	3.99	2.83	4.45	3.29	.791	4.17	3.19	4.28	2.90	.064
	Pa	5.57	3.41	7.09	2.47	10.861**	6.30	3.11	6.36	3.01	.016
	Pp	15.30	4.08	13.74	3.99	7.218**	13.55	3.84	15.96	4.07	18.439**
	Sc	4.75	3.66	5.82	3.18	4.078*	5.25	3.30	5.11	3.75	.079
	As	7.32	3.78	8.87	2.72	8.179**	8.01	3.49	8.21	3.22	.171
	Ps	3.80	3.45	7.56	3.84	46.734**	5.90	4.20	5.35	3.96	1.093

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 3. Comparisons of female and male within culture (American and Indonesian) on the CAQ scales.

		American					Indonesian				
		Female		Male			Female		Male		
Part	Scale	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Fo	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Fo
I	A	8.33	2.50	7.67	2.28	1.781	8.91	2.13	8.20	1.93	2.911
	C	10.33	3.17	12.17	2.63	9.242**	7.65	2.09	10.12	2.89	24.585**
	E	8.80	3.16	10.60	3.40	7.318**	7.18	2.47	8.47	2.57	6.339*
	F	9.25	2.60	10.15	2.52	2.938	6.28	2.47	7.75	2.48	8.380**
	G	11.76	2.61	10.25	2.89	7.388**	9.71	2.32	9.17	2.18	1.369
	H	9.70	3.60	9.35	3.40	.236	8.50	2.60	10.32	3.15	9.944**
	I	9.58	2.86	7.87	3.24	7.686**	8.60	2.29	9.25	2.88	1.562
	L	9.55	2.53	8.90	2.68	1.504	9.43	2.13	8.87	2.54	1.407
	M	9.75	2.86	9.95	2.59	.126	7.55	2.31	8.20	2.52	1.764
	N	7.35	2.61	6.20	2.06	5.456*	8.26	2.28	9.15	2.14	.424
	O	6.78	2.63	6.82	3.19	.005	7.61	2.99	8.00	2.53	.045
	Q1	7.98	3.12	9.05	2.80	3.031	6.75	2.35	7.22	2.74	.855
	Q2	9.16	2.42	8.92	3.03	.194	7.21	2.36	10.30	2.20	5.090*
	Q3	9.78	2.71	9.85	2.72	.014	9.60	2.23	9.62	2.72	.002
	Q4	7.48	3.23	6.95	2.97	.694	8.26	2.26	7.50	2.29	2.722
II	D1	3.41	3.40	3.12	3.27	.181	6.08	3.84	4.45	3.47	4.680*
	D2	2.20	2.96	2.80	3.62	.822	4.33	2.74	3.57	3.36	1.528
	D3	11.86	3.40	14.22	3.56	11.105**	13.68	3.15	14.92	3.58	3.333
	D4	6.45	2.88	5.52	4.27	1.673	7.65	2.72	6.22	2.76	6.466*
	D5	6.05	3.78	7.57	5.39	2.758	9.35	2.86	8.55	3.30	1.655
	D6	5.88	4.20	6.50	5.25	.421	11.86	3.81	10.40	3.92	3.468
	D7	3.81	2.93	4.25	2.69	.558	4.53	3.42	4.32	3.13	.095
	Pa	5.35	3.51	5.90	3.26	.621	7.26	2.31	6.82	2.71	.760
	Pp	14.45	3.73	16.57	4.29	6.884*	12.66	3.77	15.35	3.80	12.041**
	Sc	4.10	3.18	5.27	4.22	2.510	6.40	3.03	4.95	3.25	5.171*
	As	6.85	3.76	8.02	3.75	2.341	9.18	2.77	8.40	2.62	1.199
	Ps	3.70	3.31	3.95	3.69	.124	8.10	3.84	6.75	3.76	3.012

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 4. Comparisons of sex by culture on the CAQ scales.

		Female					Male				
		American		Indonesian			American		Indonesian		
Part	Scale	Mean	SD	Mean	SE	Fo	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Fo
I	A	8.33	2.50	8.91	2.13	1.888	7.67	2.28	8.20	1.93	1.231
	C	10.33	3.17	7.65	2.09	29.822**	12.17	2.63	10.12	2.89	10.977**
	E	8.80	3.16	7.18	2.47	9.733**	10.60	3.40	8.47	2.57	9.928**
	F	9.25	2.60	6.28	2.47	40.917**	10.15	2.52	7.75	2.48	18.316**
	G	11.76	2.61	9.71	2.32	20.579**	10.25	2.89	9.17	2.18	3.512
	H	9.70	3.60	8.50	2.60	4.366*	9.35	3.40	10.32	3.15	1.766
	I	9.58	2.86	8.60	2.29	4.317*	7.87	3.24	9.25	2.88	4.088*
	L	9.55	2.53	9.43	2.13	.074	8.90	2.68	8.87	2.54	.002
	M	9.75	2.86	7.55	2.31	21.468**	9.95	2.59	8.20	2.52	9.362**
	N	7.35	2.61	8.26	2.28	4.181*	6.20	2.06	9.15	2.14	3.247
	O	6.78	2.63	7.61	2.99	2.620	6.82	3.19	8.00	2.53	.286
	Q1	7.98	3.12	6.75	2.35	5.968*	9.05	2.80	7.22	2.74	8.647**
	Q2	9.16	2.42	7.21	2.36	19.839**	8.92	3.03	10.30	2.20	.667
	Q3	9.78	2.71	9.60	2.23	.163	9.85	2.72	9.62	2.72	.137
	Q4	7.48	3.23	8.26	2.26	2.364	6.95	2.97	7.50	2.29	.855
II	D1	3.41	3.40	6.08	3.84	16.208**	3.12	3.27	4.45	3.47	3.083
	D2	2.20	2.96	4.33	2.74	16.766**	2.80	3.62	3.57	3.36	.982
	D3	11.86	3.40	13.68	3.15	9.200**	14.22	3.56	14.92	3.58	.768
	D4	6.45	2.88	7.65	2.72	5.478*	5.52	4.27	6.22	2.76	.756
	D5	6.05	3.78	9.35	2.86	28.975**	7.57	5.39	8.55	3.30	.950
	D6	5.88	4.20	11.86	3.81	66.592**	6.50	5.25	10.40	3.92	14.144**
	D7	3.81	2.93	4.53	3.42	1.518	4.25	2.69	4.32	3.13	.013
	Pa	5.35	3.51	7.26	2.31	12.440**	5.90	3.26	6.82	2.71	1.898
	Pp	14.45	3.73	12.66	3.77	6.765*	16.57	4.29	15.35	3.80	1.822
	Sc	4.10	3.18	6.40	3.03	16.430**	5.27	4.22	4.95	3.25	.148
	As	6.85	3.76	9.18	2.77	14.956**	8.02	3.75	8.40	2.62	.267
	Ps	3.70	3.31	8.10	3.84	45.088**	3.95	3.69	6.75	3.76	11.289**

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$